

REMARKS

**Status of Claims:**

Claims 4, 7, 8, and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 25-31 have been added. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-10, 12-31 remain for examination.

**Prior Art Rejection:**

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-18 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Aratani. Further, claims 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Aratani in view of Han. Finally, claims 9 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Aratani in view of applicant's admitted prior art (Fig. 6).

The Examiners rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended all of the independent claims to include limitations identical or substantially the same as the limitations added to claim 1 as a representative example, to wit:

wherein a non-display period is provided between a common timing of each of said vertical image synchronizing signals and a timing of said image data; and

wherein said filter parameters are multiplexed with the decoded image data in said non-display period.

These limitations are not found in the prior art Aratani reference taken singly or in combination with Han.

While the above limitations are somewhat similar to those found in claim 16, applicant has studied the corresponding cited portions of Aratani (Figs. 1 and 2; Col. 4, lines 42-55 and Col. 8, line 33- Col., 9, line 38) and can find no teaching there of the above recited limitations. In particular the cited portions of Aratani (nor the remainder of Aratani) simply do not disclose the vertical synchronization signals that are all synchronized with each other (un-amended portion of claim 1, for example) nor doe Aratani disclose the recited non-display period provided between a common timing of each of said vertical synchronization signals and a timing of the image data, wherein said filter parameters are multiplexed with the

decoded image data in the non-display period.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every recited claim limitation. As indicated above, this is certainly not the case here and thus the Sec. 102 rejection must be withdrawn.

The rejection of some of the dependent claims utilizing the primary reference of Aratani in combination with the secondary Han reference or applicants APA is deemed to be overcome inasmuch as the deficiencies of the primary reference are not shown in the secondary references and thus the combined teachings of the prior art do not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

**Conclusion:**

In view of the amendments made hereto to applicant's independent claims, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as presently amended, clearly define applicant's invention over the Aratani reference taken either singularly or in combination with Han or applicant's admitted prior art.

In view of the amendments made hereto and the arguments set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4-22-04

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,257